

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 20. This sheet replaces original Fig. 20. In Fig. 20, numeral "0113" has been changed to --115--.

Figs. 8, 9 and 20 have had the leading "0" removed from all numerals.

Figs. 1-4, 6 and 8-19 have been corrected to appropriately space the numerals and wording in the figures.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets
Annotated sheet of Fig. 20 showing changes.

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-15, 17-19 and 21-26 remain pending in this application.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 16, 20 and 27 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

No new claims have been added. No claims have been withdrawn.

Drawings

The drawings have been corrected to overcome the Examiner's objections.

However, with respect to numeral 109a, the Examiner's attention is directed to the specification at page 17, line 15. Replacement sheets of drawings are being submitted along with a marked-up version of Fig. 20.

Claim Objections and 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

The objection to claim 8 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of that claim without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to remove the word "appropriate."

35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claims 1, 2, 25, 33 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yamamoto (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152339). Claims 3-7, 26-28 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in

view of Brewer et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,163). Claims 9-12 and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Achiwa et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0009438). Claims 13, 14 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoogterp (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0210218) in view of Yamamoto. Claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoogterp in view of Yamamoto as applied to claims 13, 14 and 24, and further in view of Brewer et al. Claims 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoogterp in view of Yamamoto as applied to claims 13, 14 and 24, and further in view of Achiwa et al. These rejections are traversed as follows.

The claims have been amended to clarify that the present invention is directed to a storage system in which when a particular logical volume or physical volume is protected, data cannot be written to that particular logical volume or physical volume from either a controller that handles file I/O requests or a controller that handles block I/O requests for a specified period of time. Therefore, if a file system protect request is issued from a NAS client, the corresponding logical or physical volume will also be protected from a SAN client. The cited references are silent regarding this point.

Appl. No. 10/802,853
Amendment dated August 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2006

274.43202X00

Request for Interview

Applicants request that the Examiner conduct an interview with the undersigned prior to issuing another Office Action. In this regard, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to arrange an appropriate date and time for such interview.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By 
Shrinath Malur
Reg. No. 34,663
(703) 684-1120